



Class E 680


Book .W6

Author _____

Title _____

Imprint _____

16-27179-1 GPO



8
Capt. J. H. Mosby

A D D R E S S

OF

General J. T. Winsmith,

OF

S O U T H C A R O L I N A .

Delivered before the Republican Mass Meeting at Spartanburg, S. C., October 17, 1876.

COLUMBIA, S.

PRINTED AT SUNDAY HERALD BOOK AND JOB OFFICE.

1877.



A D D R E S S

OF

General J. C. Winsmith,

OF

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Delivered before the Republican Mass Meeting at Spartanburg, S. C., October 17, 1876.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:

PRINTED AT SUNDAY HERALD BOOK AND JOB OFFICE.

1877.

FILED
WU

Q13 84 44
GEORGE J. HODGINS

LC I 7 D. 45

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION---1876

— • —

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA:
Lord Brougham has said "until time shall be no more will a test of the progress which mankind has made in wisdom and in virtue be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington." My countrymen, the name of Washington stands like a Colossus upon the pages of history—the "Father of his Country," the Cincinnatus of the west, who led his countrymen to victory and a nation to glory. Heedless of his voice of admonitory and paternal wisdom, the fierce strife of bitter sectionalism and disjunctive provincialism has brought woes unnumbered upon our once happy country, has crimsoned our land with the blood of thousands untimely slain, and has cast the dismal glare of barbarism over the face of fair America. In his farewell address to his countrymen our noble Washington said: "It will be worthy of a free and enlightened and, at no distant period, a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence." Again he said: "I have labored to discourage all kinds of local attachments and distinctions of country by denominating the whole by the greater name of American." Oblivious of those ideas of "exalted justice and benevolence," forgetting the very name of "American" citizen, the attempt was made to trample in the dust the flag of our country, to tear into shreds its noble history, and to establish upon a corner stone of human slavery a southern sectional confederacy. For four long and bloody years, on more than a score of battle fields, did I strive to strike down the flag of my country, but there it floats still,

MS. A. 9. 2. 1. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

the star spangled banner, over the land of the free and the home of the brave, and I thank God that I am here to-day to declare to you, my countrymen, that never again will I essay to strike with uplifted hand that noble ensign of freedom. I thank God that I am here to-day to re-echo the words of that noble soldier General Robert E. Lee. Here are his words: "Secession is anarchy. If I owned the four million of slaves in the south, I would cheerfully emancipate them all to save the union."

My countrymen, I come before you at a time when there are indications that dire calamities may again fall upon us; when the whole air seems bristling with savage threats; when the tramp of armed men seems to be resounding throughout our commonwealth. I would to God that this angry strife may cease, that this semblance of war may vanish and that arms in the hands of civilians may be thrown into the middle of the ocean. I would that by fair and temperate discussion the truth may be evolved in regard to the mighty political issues now before the people. I would that these noble words of Louis XIV to the Dauphin of France might be emblazoned in golden characters upon the sky above us, so that all might read and ponder them: "My son, do not follow my example with regard to war; endeavor to live in peace with your neighbors; follow always the most moderate counsels; endeavor to reduce the taxes; these are my last words; let them sink deep into your mind; remember that kings die like other men."

To enable us properly to discuss and consider the political issues now before the people, it is necessary that we recur to the past. We must recollect that gloom, desolation, decay and death await those who ignore the past. We must study it. We must listen to its voice. We must remember that it is full of instruction and power, and that it is neither lightly to be disregarded nor arbitrarily dealt with.

Now, what were the causes of our late war? In the language of Dr. Francis Lieber, I would answer, slavery, states rights doctrine and southern jealousy at northern progress.

The congress of the confederate states declared that because of the election by the people of the United States "of a president and vice-president hostile to the south and her institutions the southern states withdrew from the union." "Her institutions," in the plural, means of course the one institution of slavery, for the south was characterized by no other institution. Vice-President Stevens declared that slavery was a social, moral and political benefit, and that the southern confederacy was founded upon the corner stone of slavery. The Saviour of the world, in his sermon on the mount, speaks of the foolish man who built his house upon the sand: "And the rain descended and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it." The slaves in the southern states were held by a tenure of force. Blackstone says that capture in war cannot reduce a person to slavery and make him property, and that a tenure by force gives no right of property in a human being. White men and white women were bought and sold by the Turks in Constantinople and in modern Barbary, and yet they were not property. We know, as a historical fact, that James Madison, that great and good man, a leading member in the federal convention, was solicitous to guard the language of the constitution of the United States so as not to convey the idea that there could be property in man. What says that great philosopher and legal writer, Dr. Francis Lieber? "The idea of making a man a slave, that is of subjecting all he has and is to the disposal of a master, who is not bound on his part to render anything in return, is at war with the first principles of bodies politic. Slavery can never be a legal relation. It rests entirely on force." When the southern confederacy was being founded upon that corner stone of slavery what was the opinion of the civilized world; what was the opinion of the fathers of our glorious republic in reference to it? In the fifteenth century the parliament of Toulouse declared that every man who entered the kingdom of France should become free. In the sixteenth century the court of King's bench in England declared to the same effect. The foremost minds in America were opposed to it.

Hear what that noble patriot George Washington, the first president of the United States, said in reference to it: "There is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of slavery." John Adams, the second president of the United States, said: "I have held the practice of slavery in such abhorrence that I have never owned a negro or any other slave." Hear what Thomas Jefferson, the third president of the United States, said: "With what execration should the statesman be loaded who permits one-half of the citizens to trample on the rights of the other, transforming one-half into despots and the other into enemies, destroying the morals of the one part and the love of country of the other." James Madison, the fourth president of the United States, said: "We have seen the mere distinction of color made a ground of the most oppressive dominion ever exercised by man over man." The views entertained by James Monroe, the fifth president of the United States, and by John Quincy Adams, the sixth president of the United States, were all in opposition to slavery. Major-General Andrew Jackson, the seventh president of the United States, in his address to the men of color on the 18th of December, 1814, at New Orleans, said: "Soldiers, from the shores of Mobile I collected you to arms. I invited you to share the perils and divide the glory of your white countrymen. I expected much from you. I knew that you loved the land of your nativity and that, like ourselves, you had to defend all that is most dear to man. But you surpass my hopes. I have found in you that noble enthusiasm which impels to great deeds." That noble general, the Marquis de LaFayette, who came from the shores of France to aid our country in the struggle for independence, said: "I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America could I have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of slavery." Such, my countrymen, were the opinions of the noblest patriots this world has ever produced in reference to slavery, that corner stone upon which the southern confederacy was founded. Mr. Webster has said: "The lightning is strong, the tornado is strong, the earthquake is strong, but there is

something stronger than all of these. It is the enlightened judgment of mankind." Founded upon slavery, the southern confederacy has gone down amid wreck and ruin, to rise no more forever, drenched with the blood of thousands untimely slain.

The next cause of our late war was states rights doctrine, that disjunctive doctrine according to which each portion of our country, called a state, is sovereign in the highest sense, allowing us no nationality, no country, and consequently no national government. The leading secessionists urged the strange idea that the state was superior to the general government, that a part was greater than the whole, overlooking the fact that the *United States* had rights too, and greater rights than any *single state*. A double allegiance would be a fearful problem for a conscientious citizen and worse than the allegiance of the feudal times, which was a graduated allegiance but not a double or multiplied one. We cannot faithfully serve two masters. The leading secessionists overlooked the fact that the constitution of the United States is a national work from beginning to end, conceived by the living national spirit of "one people" in spite of destructive provincialism. The instrument, says Dr. Lieber, is called a constitution, not articles. The word sovereign does not appear once. A national legislature, the members of which vote individually and personally, not by states, and an eminently national and individual executive in the person of one man are established; and a majority of the people or of the states can oblige the smaller portion to adopt amendments to the constitution. No minority of sovereigns, however small, can be made subject to a majority of sovereigns however large. This single fact would annihilate state sovereignty. We are a *nation*. Washington said: "That bantling—I had almost said monster—state sovereignty." Alexander Hamilton said: "A nation without a national government is an awful spectacle." And yet Mr. Calhoun denied even the national character in the president of the United States, and allowed only a joint representation of the many different state sovereignties within his individuality, by what mysterious process it is impossible

for us to see. With him liberty appeared to consist in a warring opposition to the national government, and he openly declared the loosest possible confederacy the best of all governments while the whole world was agreed to consider it in modern times the worst, and confederations good only in as far as they unite and not as far as they sever. Mr. Calhoun even went so far as to contend that states should be admitted into the union by *couples*—one free and one slave state at a time—overlooking the fact that slavery has never been a stable system, but has always melted away before advancing civilization. It is strange that Mr. Calhoun never allowed the noble words of Patrick Henry to touch a chord in his breast when he said: "Where are your landmarks, your boundaries of colonies? They are all thrown down. The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers and New Englanders are now no more. I am not a Virginian but an *American*." Why did Mr. Calhoun not consider the warning words of General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, when he said: "Let us then consider all attempts to weaken this union by maintaining that each state is separately and individually independent as a species of political heresy, which may bring on us the most serious distresses." The ideas of Mr. Calhoun, in regard to government, do not appear to have emanated from any consideration for the real *wants* of the people, but his political course seems to have been dictated by an ambitious design to force his own peculiar and fanciful theories upon them. He lacked that lofty feeling for humanity which is so characteristic of the noble patriot. Said Mr. Wirt of Aaron Burr: "Civil life is indeed quiet upon its surface but in its bosom this man has contrived to deposit the materials which with the slightest touch of his match produce an explosion to shake the continent." Happy indeed would it have been for South Carolina had she heeded the voice of that noble South Carolinian, the hero of Talladega, of Tohopeka and New Orleans, Major-General Andrew Jackson, the seventh president of the United States, when he said: "Take care of your nullifiers you have amongst you, those men who would sever and destroy the

only good government on the globe, and that prosperity and happiness we enjoy over every other portion of the world; who would involve the country in civil war and all the evils in its train, that they might reign and ride on its whirlwinds and direct the storm. Let them meet the indignant frowns of every man who loves his country. The tariff, it is now known, was a mere pretext and disunion and a southern confederacy the real object. The *next pretext* will be the negro or the slavery question." Happy indeed for South Carolina would it have been had she heeded the voice of warning of that noble patriot Chief Justice John Belton O'Neill, when he said: "Secession will be the ruin of South Carolina."

The third cause of the war, says Dr. Lieber, was southern jealousy at northern progress—a fevering jealousy when it was perceived that civilization, number of population, the arts, education, the ships and trade, schools and churches, literature and law, manufactures, agriculture, inventions, wealth, comfort and power were rapidly finding their home at the north to the great disparagement of the south, weighted down by slavery, which nevertheless the south would not recognize as an evil. All periods of such developments or changes of power and influence from one portion of a country to another, or from one class to another, have been periods of heartburning, but in this case the vaunting pride of the receding or lagging portion forbade them to acknowledge the cause. Like Pericles, with regard to the Patricians at Athens, the leading secessionists paid court to this *unfounded prejudice* against the north and fanned a flame which resulted in a wide spread conflagration.

For the causes which I have enumerated our entire country was plunged into a bloody war, in which three millions of armed soldiers were engaged in the work of death. In the dreadful carnage which followed secession the best and purest young men of our entire country sank down into early graves. The war was fought mainly by those who had no part in bringing it on, while many of those who were instrumental in bringing about the contest took no part in the bloody con-

flict. And so it has ever been. The men who make the quarrels are not the only men to fight. Upon this point what said that noble soldier General Robert E. Lee? Here are his words: "The position of the two sections which they held to each other was brought about by the politicians of the country. The great masses of the people, if they had understood the real question, would have avoided the war." Governor Orr said that in 1860 there were not ten thousand secessionists in the state of South Carolina, and yet a few violent secession leaders forced the people out of the union.

I have referred particularly to the *causes* of our late war to show how untenable they were, because the democratic leaders have declared over and over again, since the war ended, that they *never will* admit that *the cause* itself failed and that *the principles* which gave it life were wrong. That the war which was inaugurated by violent sectional partisans for the *causes* enumerated should have utterly failed in its object was not unlooked for by the philosophical historian. The southern confederacy fell, and its fall is thus graphically described by McCabe in his "Life of General R. E. Lee:" "Up the ascent to the capital of the southern confederacy was the array, with its unbroken line of blue, fringed with bright bayonets. Strains of martial music, flushed countenances, waving swords, betokened the victorious army. Along the line of fire, in the midst of the horrors of a conflagration, increased by the explosion of shells left by the retreating army, through curtains of smoke, through the vast aerial auditorium, convulsed with the commotion of frightful sounds, moved the garish procession of the grand army of the United States, with brave music and bright banners and wild cheers. Thus fell the capital of the southern confederacy. It went down in a sea of suffering and sorrow, such as had never been known before."

As the result of the bloody conflict of secession the supremacy of the constitution and laws of the United States *over* the constitution and laws of any state was established and freedom flashed down upon four millions of slaves in the southern states. It came like a flash of golden light from

heaven, and the republican party was triumphant. In the very hour of victory Abraham Lincoln, the humblest of the humble before his own conscience, and among the greatest before history, laid down his life for human freedom. Like Socrates, he died for the cause of truth. While contemplating the triumph of the republican party upon the field of battle we must not omit to consider the great *ideas* which hovered above the conflict of arms. When two armies meet, says Cousin, there is presented a much greater spectacle than that from which philanthropy turns away her eyes in horror. She sees only thousands of men who are about to cut each other down. But here men are not the object of contention, but *causes*, the *opposing spirit* of an epoch, the different ideas which in an age animate and agitate humanity. Battles are the signal promulgation of the decrees of civilization itself. Thus Napoleon, after marching through Europe, and putting his foot upon the heads of kings and princes, said at Fontainebleau, in the hour of his misfortune: "I am not conquered by coalesced armies but by liberal ideas." The triumph of the republican party in the late conflict was the triumph of the union over disjunctive provincialism, of freedom over slavery, of northern progress over southern torpidity and exclusiveness.

When the war ended, the democratic leaders at the south utterly repudiated its results and proceeded to establish a galling system of peonage or serfdom upon the *debris* of slavery. In 1865 the democratic legislature of South Carolina enacted a monstrous law, known as the *Black Code*, among the provisions of which was the following: "The master shall have the right to inflict upon the servant such *corporal punishment* as he may think proper." Seeing the cruel spirit manifested at the south against persons of the dark class, the republican party of the nation, through the congress of the United States, adopted the reconstruction acts and amended the constitution of the United States, giving the right of suffrage and all the rights of *American citizens* to persons of the dark class. Even then, when the democratic leaders had shown such a violent hostility to the results of

the war, and when Senator Sherman, the author of the reconstruction acts, was urged to insert in them a sweeping clause of dis-franchisement, he said, in the United States senate: "Men ought to be satisfied without further exactions from the late rebels. They had lost everything they held dear and the people of the north did not demand their disfranchisement." Notwithstanding the magnanimity of the national republican party, in removing political disabilities from the democratic leaders, they have kept up a fierce strife against the government of the United States, refusing to acknowledge in good faith the rights of citizenship conferred upon the dark class, holding the reconstruction acts to be *revolutionary, unconstitutional and void*, and looking for their *overthrow*. They have declared that they never will admit that *the cause* of the southern confederacy failed, and that the principles which gave it life were wrong. These men have inaugurated a system of persecutions and outrages upon republicans by armed and disguised bands of midnight marauders which have shocked the civilized world. Of these outlaws, the Hon. Reverdy Johnson, who was brought down from Maryland to defend them, was compelled to say: "*I have listened with unmixed horror to some of the testimony which has been brought before you. The outrages proved are shocking to humanity; they admit of neither excuse or justification; they violate every obligation which law and nature imposes upon men; they show that the parties engaged were brutes, insensible to the obligations of humanity and religion. The day will come, however, if it has not already arrived, when they will deeply lament it. Even if justice shall not overtake them, there is one tribunal from which there is no hope. It is their own judgment—that tribunal which sits in the breast of every living man—that small, still voice that thrills through the heart—the soul of the mind, and as it speaks gives happiness or torture—the voice of conscience, the voice of God. If it has not already spoken to them in tones which have startled them to the enormity of their conduct, I trust, in the mercy of heaven, that that voice will speak before they shall be called above to account for the transactions of this world. That it will so speak as to make them*

penitent, and that trusting in the dispensations of heaven, whose justice is dispensed with mercy, when they shall be brought before the bar of their great tribunal, so to speak, that incomprehensible tribunal, there will be found in the fact of their penitence, or in their previous lives, some grounds upon which God may say pardon."

I, too, join in the prayer of the great advocate, and trust when the great day comes, when the secrets of all hearts shall be known, God may say to them pardon. I would also desire that the leaders may be pardoned if they shall become penitent. I trust no monstrous apparition may rise before them to say "thou shalt see me at Phillipi." I trust they may never be compelled to exclaim "oh, coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!" I trust they may never have to say "thou art too like the spirit of Banquo—down!"

To-day, my countrymen, what do we behold in this nation? Two political parties arrayed against each other in the contest for supremacy; and what are their elements? On the one side we have the glorious national union republican party. The national convention at Cincinnati spoke with no uncertain voice. The nomination there made means that this country shall continue to be a *nation*; it means that every citizen of the United States shall be *free*, not in name only but in *reality*; it means *protection* to the humblest individual in the expression of his political opinions and in the exercise of his political rights; it means the education and elevation of the toiling and struggling masses of the people, and it means the establishment upon a sure and firm foundation of all the results of the war for the preservation of this union. In the national convention at Cincinnati what do we behold? Patriots of the dark class of our countrymen freely consulting with patriots of the light class for the best interests of the nation. There no false ideas in regard to color contracted the minds of our noble representatives. They met together upon a common level as free American citizens, striving for the welfare of our glorious republic. The nominees of that convention were that gallant general and noble statesman General Rutherford B. Hayes, for the presidency of the

United States, and that statesman without fear and without reproach the Hon. William A. Wheeler, for the vice presidency. For the union, for freedom and equal rights to *all* men, General Rutherford B. Hayes toiled and struggled and freely shed his blood. During the war he was nominated for congress, but what was his reply? "Thanks, I have other business just now. Any man who would leave the army at this time to electioneer for congress ought to be scalped." The Hon. William A. Wheeler, of New York, republican nominee for the vice-presidency, is a statesman of great intellectual capacity, a pure patriot, and noble champion of freedom and equal rights to all men.

Now let us reverse the picture. What do we behold on the other side? A democratic convention at St. Louis. There not a single representative of the dark class was allowed to invade the sacred presence. The nominations there made were made by white men and for white men only. And who are the nominees? S. J. Tilden for the presidency and T. A. Hendricks for the vice presidency. And who is S. J. Tilden? We will let the Hon. Horace Greeley answer. Mr. Greeley, in speaking of Tilden's connection with the great frauds of Tammany and the democracy throughout the empire state, said: "You, S. J. Tilden, not merely by silence but by positive assumption, have covered these frauds with the mantle of your respectability. On the principle that the receiver is as bad as the thief, you are as deeply implicated in them to-day as though your name were Tweed, O'Brien or Oakey Hall." Tilden, the boon companion of W. M. Tweed, the champion thief of the age, the democratic nominee for the presidency of the United States! The democratic nominee for the vice-presidency is T. A. Hendricks, a knight of the golden circle, a traitor to the union in the hour of greatest peril. Out of his own mouth let him be condemned. On the 16th of February, 1866, he said, in the United States senate: "We do not propose to let the negroes vote. I am free to say that I do not want to make any of them voters. We are not of the same race. We are so different that we ought not to compose one political community." T. A.

Hendricks, a narrow minded, malignant and selfish white liner, the democratic nominee for the vice-presidency of the United States.

My countrymen, the great question presented by the two political parties in the United States to-day is whether our fellow-citizens of the dark class have rights which the light class is bound to respect. The republican party of the nation says they have. The democratic party, by its entire course since the war ended, says they have not. Let us show how unfounded is this democratic prejudice against our fellow-citizens of the dark class. The revolutionary war with England found the colored as well as white soldiers fighting side by side in the struggle for liberty and independence. Who does not remember the history of Crispus Attucks, the noble colored hero who poured out his life's blood for American freedom at Boston on the 5th of March, 1770. "Don't hesitate! Come on! We will drive these British minions out of Boston!" were the last words of this martyr to American liberty. In the war of 1812 the colored soldiers helped to fight the battles of our country both by land and sea, and we find that Major-General Andrew Jackson, the hero of New Orleans, acknowledged their services in the highest terms of praise, for addressing them on the 18th of December, 1814, he said: "Soldiers, the president of the United States shall be informed of your conduct on the present occasion, and the voices of the representatives of the American nation shall applaud your valor as your general now praises your ardor." In the late war thousands of colored soldiers fell on the field of battle, fighting for liberty and the union. The republican party of the nation acknowledged the noble services of the dark soldiers. Now, what was the course pursued by the confederate congress in regard to the colored men? McCabe, in his life of General Lee, says: "The act of the confederate congress authorized President Davis to accept such slaves as the masters might choose to put into the military service. In short no inducement was to be offered to the negro. He was to be forced to fight for his own captivity." This, my countrymen, was the solemn

act of the confederate congress, although General Lee said "the colored men furnish a more promising material than many armies of which we read in history which owed their efficiency to discipline alone. I think those who are employed should be freed. It would be neither just nor wise, in my opinion, to require them to serve as slaves." What has been the course of the democratic party since the war ended in reference to citizens of the dark class? That party has been forced at the point of the bayonet to accept the results of the war, but has it *adopted* them? The democratic leaders have all the while said to their followers "agree among yourselves that you will not employ any one who votes the radical ticket." What a silly and monstrous proposition! It is suggested by minds festering with feudal tyranny and medieval barbarity. These democratic leaders have thus attempted the daring anachronism of establishing a system of serfdom or peonage in the nineteenth century upon the *debris* of slavery. They would transform into despots the *latifundium* holders, who would trample upon the dearest rights of the poor laborers. They would destroy the morals of the one class and the love of country of the other. What a spectacle would have been presented to the world by the immortal Franklin being compelled, as an apprentice, to vote at the behest of some besotted employer! The owner of property is not always a patriot and a wise man, while on the other hand the laborer may be very patriotic and intelligent. But why would these democratic leaders incorporate the disgraceful farce of allowing the laboring men to vote at all? Why not let the property holders vote for them? This, it would seem, would simplify the case very much. The proposition of these democratic leaders is shocking to humanity. As well might the attempt be made by property owners to dictate to their employees what their religious opinions should be as to attempt to deprive them of the liberty of the elective franchise. The constitution of the United States guarantees freedom alike in the expression of both. Do the democratic leaders presume that the *sole object* of the republican party in conferring the elective franchise upon men of the dark class

was to enable them to vote the satellites of the democracy into office and power? Do not the democratic leaders admit that men of the dark class constitute a large part of the wealth and intelligence of South Carolina, and by far the greatest part of the labor of the state? Yet look at the democratic ticket. Upon it we see not a single representative of the dark class, although that class has a majority of thirty thousand voters in South Carolina. Why do the democratic leaders not acknowledge the rights of citizens of the dark class? Will they not admit that all men have descended from the same common ancestor? Hear the noble words of the inspired apostle, after the celestial light had flashed into his soul, when he stood in the midst of the Areopagus, surrounded by the sages and philosophers of Athens, "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Hear the enunciation of the father of the English common law: "We are taught by holy writ that there is one couple of ancestors belonging to us all, from whom the whole race of mankind is descended. The obvious and undeniable consequence is that all men are in some degree related to each other." The continental sages of America re-echoed in Independence Hall, one hundred years ago, the immortal declaration "all men are created equal." Under Lincoln and Grant and Sherman this great truth stands forth a noble realization, though it has been sprinkled with the blood of tens of thousands of the heroes who battled in the cause of freedom and equal rights to all men. The thoughtful student of history can never for one moment doubt the high capacities of men of the dark class. He sees Osiris and Sesostris leading their countrymen to deeds of valor and glory. He beholds them passing over the Caucasus and the dark stream of the Don to teach European Thrace that they were the kings of kings. He sees them driving eastward their chariot steeds to slake their thirst in the far Ganges. He beholds the soldierly qualities and high military renown of those dark generals of antiquity Hamilcar, Asdrubal and Hannibal. He sees Masanissa, a Numidian general, second in

command to Publius Cornelius Scipio, gaining brilliant victories. He beholds Lucius Septimius Severus, an African born, Roman emperor. He sees men of the dark class members of the British parliament and of the French assembly. In tracing the pages of history the philosophical historian is impressed with the fact that throughout all ages *intellect* and *moral worth* have been the tests of advancement and promotion, without regard to external circumstances of hue or condition. And shall it not be so in America, in this the nineteenth century—in this the land consecrated to *freedom* and *equal rights* to *all* men? The republican party of the nation says that it *shall* be so. But, ah! the leaders of the democratic party say that because men of the dark class form a part of the body politic the governments are corrupt! What will these leaders say in reference to the testimony of Governor McNutt, of Mississippi? In his message he says: "Thirteen tax collectors are in default for the year 1838 in the sum of \$23,000, and twenty-one in the sum of \$32,000 for the taxes of 1839." What will these leaders say in reference to the *Yazoo fraud* in Georgia? The Georgia legislature was *bribed* to sell a part of the public domain. Sparks, in his history, the "Memories of Fifty Years," thus speaks of the infamy of the act: "Jackson, heading the new legislature and the indignant public, proceeded in procession to the public square where the law and the fagots were piled. Addressing the assembled multitude, he denounced the men who had voted for the law as bribed villains, those who had bribed them and the governor who had signed it. He declared that fire from heaven only could sanctify the indignation of God and man in consuming the condemned record of accursed crime. Then with a Promethean glass condensing the sun's rays he kindled the flame which consumed the records containing the hated Yazoo act." I have cited these instances to show that corruption is not alone incident to the governments in which men of the dark class form a part of the body politic. I do most solemnly condemn fraud and corruption in the administration of government wherever existing. Republican officials who have betrayed their trusts

are amenable to the laws, and justice will surely overtake them. I am here to advocate the noble and enduring principles of *equality* and *justice*, upon which the republican party is founded. If the government is placed in the hands of the democratic party is there any assurance that the rights and liberties of the toiling and struggling masses of the people will be respected? Let me cite an instance in the history of the late confederate states. McCabe, in his *Life of General Lee*, says: "It would have been some comfort to the men in the confederate army to see the government meet its obligations, and a still greater comfort to have been able to send the money to those who were starving at home; yet this was denied them. President Davis and his aids drew their pay promptly, but the men in the trenches were supposed to have no use for money. Meanwhile their families were starving." My countrymen, let not the democratic leaders again delude you. The triumph of the democratic party would bring strife, dissension and civil discord upon our fair land, and the palsyng gloom of black despair would settle down upon us. Class distinctions would be revived and a fierce struggle to overcome all the beneficent results of the late war would at once be inaugurated.


I would here say a word to those whose inclination is to come into the republican party but who have been deterred by fears of what is called social ostracism. *Ostracism!* What is that? Remember, my friends, the ostracism of the virtuous Socrates and of Aristides the just. But you will find that the Athenians, repenting of their cruelty, punished the murderers of the former with death, and recalled the latter to posts of the highest honor in the state, banishing into eternal exile his dastardly calumniators. Subject, my friends, your motives to action in regard to your political course, to the approval or disapproval of that inward monitor whose utterances are not to be disregarded. Do not be driven from the path of duty by the combined power of ridicule, opprobrium and scorn, the dull sneer of the coxcomb or the compassionating shrug of the dastard. Possess yourselves with the lofty spirit of Alcibiades, who when his house was surrounded at midnight


by armed bands of his calumniators, and set on fire, rushed forth, sword in hand, to meet the assailants of his honor.

Fellow-republicans, the union republican party intends that ours shall be a grand continental republic. In the eloquent language of Senator Morton, "we have one language, one flag and one common destiny." The union republican party intends that this union shall be composed of states which cannot be destroyed. It intends that this American nation, with the French, the English, the German nations, shall draw the chariot of civilization abreast, as the ancient steeds drew the car of victory. The union republican party of this nation has labored in the cause of freedom, so that to-day the sun does not shine on any slave in our broad land. We are all to-day free American citizens, and what a glorious privilege it is to be an American citizen! There is no spot on this globe, however remote, where the "starry flag" will not protect you. While under its sacred folds foreign kings and principalities and powers dare not molest you. At home, in our own country, the union republican party has declared that you shall be also protected in the exercise of *all* your rights, no matter what may be your color or your religious or political opinions. If there be any so blinded by hate and party prejudice who would attempt to outrage you and deprive you of your rights the heavy hand of the national government, like an avenging fury, will be laid upon them. I trust we may all be mild and tolerant in the expression and discussion of our political opinions. It does appear that there should not be greater prejudice in reference to differing political opinions than in regard to differing religious sentiments. It can never be the desire of the true patriot again to see three millions of armed soldiers engaged in the work of death. The triumphs and blessings of peace are far more pleasant to contemplate than the horrors of war, and I would that the bright rays of prosperity and happiness may be continually shed abroad over our entire country.

Fellow-republicans, the union republican party of this nation, moving forward shoulder to shoulder, will bear to a triumphant success next November our nominees for presi-

dent and vice-president of the United States, and the union republican party of the state of South Carolina will also achieve a noble victory for all its nominees on state and congressional tickets. Under the stars and stripes, under the flag of our country, under that banner which symbolizes freedom and equal rights to all men, let us all work together as one man, using all honorable means for the success of our nominees. All the intelligence we have from the great north, the great east and the great west, goes to show that the union republican party there is united in solid phalanx. Our friends there are doing their whole duty, and they expect us to do ours. We cannot, for one moment, think of surrendering the government of this grand national republic into the hands of the democratic party. We must rally with the national union republican party *to establish upon a basis which never can be shaken* freedom and equal rights to all men. Our friends at Cincinnati, our friends throughout the nation have spoken, and they mean that next November victory shall perch upon our banners. On the 4th of March next General Rutherford B. Hayes will ascend the steps of the capitol as the president of more than forty millions of free citizens, and the people of this great continental republic will rejoice with loud acclaim at the triumph of *freedom and unity*. Then when the silken folds of our star spangled banner wave in triumph over the land of the free and the home of the brave—when the deep mouthed cannon announce the inauguration of the imposing ceremonies of the day—then may we all re-echo the sentiment of one of America's noblest patriots and grandest orators, "liberty and union now and forever, one and inseparable!"







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 621 7